

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRENT LEE HARDING,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORRECTIONAL HEALTH SERVICES,  
et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-00922 KJM SCR

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 31, 2025, defendants Holt and Mencias filed separate motions for summary judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56.<sup>1</sup> (ECF Nos. 50 and 51.) Plaintiff has not responded to the motions.

Local Rule 230(*l*) provides in part: “Failure of the responding party to file written opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion[.]” More than 21 days have passed since defendants’ filed their respective motions. Therefore, plaintiff will be ordered to file a response to the motion and a statement explaining why he was not able to do so in a timely manner. If plaintiff fails to file a response to the motion or fails to show good cause for his failure to file it on time, this court will deem the failure a waiver of any

---

<sup>1</sup> The court has taken the March 13, 2025, hearing on Holt’s motion off calendar pursuant to Local Rule 230(*l*). (See Docket.)

1 opposition to defendants' motion.

2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within twenty-one (21) days of the date of  
3 this order, plaintiff shall file the following:

- 4 1. A response to defendants' motions for summary judgment (ECF Nos. 50 and 51); and
- 5 2. A response to this order explaining why plaintiff was unable to file a timely response
- 6 to defendants' motion for summary judgment.

7 DATE: March 3, 2025

8  
9 

10 SEAN C. RIORDAN  
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28